

**REMARKS/ARGUMENT**

The Official Action has been carefully considered and the Examiner's comments are duly noted.

Reconsideration of this Application in light of the amendments to the claims and the arguments submitted is respectfully solicited.

It is noted that the Restriction Requirement has been withdrawn.

With respect to the objections to the claims raised in paragraph 2 to claim 3, claim 3 has now been amended.

Turning now to the claims rejections, and specifically to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Examiner has cited Latterman et al. U.S. Patent 4,010,361 against claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 17, and 19-21.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to distinguish further from the Latterman et al. patent. Specifically, while claim 1 calls for a pair of coils, and Latterman does not show a pair of coils but the Examiner has brought to the attention springs 70 and 76, claim 1 has been amended so as to indicate that there is an individual magnetizing means associated with each coil. In a similar manner, claim 10 has been amended so as to indicate that there is an individual means responsive to the magnetic field associated with each said coil. Specifically, each coil has its own magnetizable means.

The other amendments affected to the claims are of a formal nature and, for the sake of consistency, appropriate antecedent basis.

The '361 patent is quite different from the disclosure in the present Application because it does not involve the use of a coil or a pair of coils, or a stereo input signal to deflect the laser. While a single input signal is used to deflect the laser, it does so using a single transducer and, therefore, is unable to generate the more complex images that the system, according to the teachings of the present Application, is able to generate by using a synchronized dual (stereo) input signal. Claim 1, as amended, therefore, distinguishes both structurally and functionally, and is patentable over Latterman et al. Clearly,

therefore, claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 17, and 19-21 and the claims dependent thereon are patentable and allowable.

With respect to paragraph 5 and the claims rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and the citation of Effinger U.S. Patent No. 4,887,197 against claims 2, 16, and 18, these claims also distinguish both from the '361 patent, as well as the '197 patent. Also, this patent was brought to the attention of the Patent Office and clearly and carefully discussed in the specification, and the claims were originally drafted to distinguish from the Effinger patent.

The '197 patent and the '361 patent are very similar to each other and relate more to each other than to the subject matter of this Application because both use a single input signal to generate images, the differences being that the '197 patent uses a coil instead of a transducer.

Again, the product, according to the teachings of the present invention, is more advanced and is able to generate much more complex images by taking a synchronized dual (stereo) input signal and directing the laser beam on an X-Y axis. This implementation could not be assumed by or be rendered obvious by the prior art as the present invention does not simply direct the laser beam off one (1) coil which is controlled by one (1) signal then off another coil controlled by a second signal. Instead, according to the teachings of the present invention, an integrated stereo signal deflection system is provided that can take or use a single mirror and deflect it one two (2) axes by introducing two (2) signals, one (1) that moves the laser on the X axis and the other which moves the laser on the Y axis.

With respect to displays, the Examiner should appreciate the advantage of the present invention over the displays of Effinger because of the availability of two (2) coils separately controlled, there is a greater ability to change the presentation of the wave form.

As a further evidence of the patentability of the present invention, it is necessary to point out that commercial sales of the product has been successful due to the fact that

no other product on the market can generate laser images from a direct stereo input signal as efficiently and as economically as this. The most popular niche use for the product is by musicians who enjoy the ability to control the laser with their music as they play the real-time.

It is known that while commercial sales alone are not definitive for a patentability assurance, the commercial sales should be persuasive in overcoming an obviousness-type rejection.

Please take this as a request for a one (1) month term extension so as to render the response timely filed and our check in the amount of \$60.00 (small entity) is enclosed.

If there are any other outstanding charges, please charge these to our Deposit Account 50-3108.


If there are any points outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully asked to call Applicant's attorney in order to do what is necessary to place the Application into condition for allowance.

Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By:

  
J. Harold Nissen  
Reg. No. 17283  
Telephone No.: 914-723-4300  
Fax No.: 914-723-4301

Enclosure: \$60.00 check for One-Month Extension